

The late Pretence of a Constant Practice to enter the Parliament as well as Provincial Writ in the Front of the Acts of every Synod, further consider'd and Disprov'd, in a Second Letter to the Author of that Assertion; occasion'd by a Second Letter of that Author.

With a Postscript in Answer to the Postscript of that Second Letter.

AFTER my Letter to you was gone to the Press, your Second upon the Subject of your Former came to my Hand, in which I find something said by you by way of clearing, as you word it, what your Friend told you wanted to be a little explain'd; you will perceive by my Letter, that I thought it wanted much more than that, and so I think still, I shall never be against any Man's explaining an obscure Expression, or correcting an Error, if he does it Ingenuously; but to slip in an imperfect Confession upon an Alarm of the utmost Conviction in hopes to break at least, if not wholly avoid the Reproach, and call it, only clearing the Point which you hold as fast as ever you did, is not so fair and upright a way.

However I'll be at the pains of examining again how well you have clear'd either that or your self, because I think it with you a point of moment, and which when proved, will go a great way toward deciding the present Dispute, further by much than any other Ground you argue upon.

But have you then any doubt of its being made good? about three Weeks the Point now between you and me was beyond dispute, the Books shew the Practice was constant in every Synod, and the Design of it was full as undoubted, you Appeal to the Remains for the truth of your Assertion, and put all the Credit you have in the World upon your Integrity in it.

And now I appeal in my turn to the World, Whether you can be acquitted, as to the Acts of

the Convocations of York, according to the Account I have given you of them; and I appeal to you, whether it be not a just one. You say in your Second Letter (without so much as, I own or confess, that upon a more exact and careful review of my Papers, I find not any Note there of more than two Original Writs now remaining in that Convocation Book: Did you not then look them over with care and exactness, when you advanced such a positive Assertion as you grounded upon them? Wou'd any Man put his Veracity at stake upon a cursory view of his own Notes in a thing confessedly of such moment as this? I cannot think you a man of so little consideration as this, nor does your whole Paragraph carry in it any marks of inadvertence or haste, it is written with as much caution and art as so false an Assertion can be. Your Assertion is full and general and strong, and your appeal to the Records for the truth of it is so too, what you actually affirm from them, for proof, is particular; and (as to the Province we now are upon) of a different nature from what it was brought to support, for it is often sowing in the Original Writ in proof of a constant entry of it. You do not pretend to say it was always, and as it is certain you never saw any footsteps of it above twice, 'tis hard to imagine, how twice in 150 Years shou'd leave upon your Mind the Impression of often (especially when one of those times it hardly remain'd) even tho' you had not look'd over your Notes at all, when you wrote your first Letter; which yet I dare

say you will not confess: And the emphatical calling it the *VERY Original Writ* is another mark of Art, and design to lead the unwary Reader into an Opinion, that there was greater weight in that Circumstance when indeed there was less, it having been much more for your purpose if it had been copy'd into the Book; so that I cannot think your Integrity helped at all by this exacter Review.

For what alteration has this Review made in your former Assertion? not the least in the World; that stands as it did, nor do you acknowledge the Evidence of it to be weakened at all, even where you bring your *often to twice*; but all this is only clearing the Doubt of your Friend, that the *Eyes of the Clergy* may remain as open in relation to the *Premunientes*, as you are inform'd your Letter had set them at first.

But let us see what will come of this *twice sowing* in to which you are now content your *Often* shall be reduc'd, tho' you say, *There is no doubt but that many other Parliament Summons were formerly to be seen in that Book: But the Original Writ being used to be affixed to the Acts by the Drawer of them, to save himself the trouble of copying it, they were in process of time easily torn out and imbezzeled.* From these words it is plain that you would have the Assertion stand where it did, tho' you have here but two Witnesses for it, because you say there is *no doubt* but there were, and should be more, tho' they do not appear.

Now I must beg leave to say of these two, that one of them should not appear as indeed it scarce does, and the other does not speak in your Cause tho' it stands in the place.

The first that in 1584 scarce appears, above half of it being gone, whether *torn off and lost* as you say, *Let. 1. Pag. 2. Col. 1.* or rather (as the Extracter I mention'd terms it) *Reversed, i. e. purposely cut out*, as not belonging to the place where it was. However I own with you, *that so much still remains as shews what it was*, but I cannot allow that it also shews as you say, *why it was put there*: I rather think, that the *Poor Remains* of it, shew that it was not proper to stand there. And if you are not, yet I hope others will be of my mind, that it could not properly belong to that place.

For the Remains shew it was directed to the Archbishop then living and not to the Guardians of the Spiritualities, as in the next case it was; in which case, tho' the Writs being there does not concern the Convocation, yet there was more reason for its remaining at *York* (the Dean and Chapter not going to Parliament)

than there can be for a Writ to the Archbishop to remain there, the Archbishop himself going to Parliament, as he actually did at this time: And tho' it is probable from what remains, that he did not now actually carry his Writ along with him, (as perhaps in other cases it may still be often omitted) yet he must be legally supposed to do so, and you still suppose it in your first Letter, *Pag. 8. Col. 1.* where you offer to the Bishops an Endorsement upon their Parliament Writ of the Execution of it, when they bring it with them to Parliament, as a very ready and natural way of *making their Returns* upon it.

For which reason I the more wonder at your saying now, that *there is no doubt but that many other Parliament Summons were formerly to be seen in that Book*, and that the *Original Writ used to be affixed to the Acts by the Drawer of them to save himself the trouble of copying it.* How is this consistent with the Archbishop's bringing his Writ with him to Parliament? and what shall we say to the Parliament Writs of the other Bishop's of this Province of *York*, which as I have shewn in my former Letter, ought also to be here affixed or copied to prove your Assertion, tho' even that would not do, unless notice was taken of them in the Front of the Convocation as held by virtue of them, or that they were read in the Acts of the day?

That neither of these was the Case appears from the Account I have given you of those Acts, confirm'd by a Certificate from the Register himself, who takes no notice of this peice of a Writ, and therefore we may be sure did not think it ought to be a part of the Book, as the reason he suggests of the others continuing there is a particular case (*viz.*) the Vacancy of the See, and may well be the occasion as I have hinted already of its remaining at *York*, tho' it does not make it to have any proper Relation to the Convocation Acts; and so not to speak in your cause.

For this I have given I hope a sufficient reason in my former Letter, but I will further Confirm it in this. I took notice there, that in the Acts of the Day of the opening of the Convocation in 1588, Mention was made of reading the King's Writs, which seems to have led Mr. *Empson* (as I knew it had done others before,) into the opinion that the Parliament Writ there preserv'd was referr'd to, but I shew that there were two Convocation Writs to be read on that day, being the 5th of Feb. the day appointed in the Writ of Prorogation, not that of Summons, from whence I inferr'd there was no necessity of including

cluding the Parliament Writ in the *Quibusdam Brevibus Regiis*, and I added that the Writs referr'd to in the Acts were Writs *pro Celebratione hujusmodi Convocationis*, which in natural construction Excludes the Parliament Writ. There also I took notice of the want of a word *Brevis* or *Brevium* in the Front of the Convocation, (which every where that I observe mentions the Authority by which it is held) in the Transcript before me. Which was it perfect in this place (as it shall be if the Original will make it so) would as I said put this Matter out of dispute.

Let me add here, that shou'd it prove *Brevium*, as I rather think it will not, the same account that has been given of more Writs than one in the Acts themselves, will account for more in the Front of them, and that I may not be thought to say this at a venture, I will here give you a plain reason why it must do so.

In the year 1584 where the piece of the Parliament Writ is preserved the Convocation meets upon the day of Summons November 24th, a day after the Parliament, and the Front of it begins, *Convocatio, &c. Auctoritate Brevis Serenissima, &c. inchoat.* and in the Act after the Commissaries had taken the Archbishops Presidency upon them it follows *Statim perlecto Brevis Reg. &c.* which is Demonstration that the Parliament Writ of which there remains a part in this place, was not taken notice of in the Front of the Convocation or the Acts of the Day, and I think as perfect an Evidence that the Original Writ did not use as you still affirm to be affixed to the Acts by the Drawer to save himself the trouble of Copying it.

Be then the Front of the Convocation of 1588, as it will, *Brevis* or *Brevium* the latter will do you no good; nor if there should be any particular reasons from the vacancy of the See, more then I as yet apprehend, for inserting the Original Parliament Writ, at that time, will it do any thing I have said any hurt. And therefore the care of those who have had the Custody of these Convocation Records, ought not to be taxed with these Parliament Writs being torn out or Imbezzeled as you say they were, when it does not appear that they had any thing to do to preserve them.

Of the Convocation Writs indeed more care might be justly expected, and there does not seem to have been much neglect in that point, there are about 20 Convocations appear in this Book, from 1545 to the beginning of this Reign, and you take notice but of 4 Provincial Writs wanting in all that time, and I do not miss a-

bove one or two more, and they are referr'd to in the Acts when they do not appear, there are above 40 Writs of Prorogation in the same compass of time which is double the number of Convocations, and tho' some few are still wanting, yet I hope these are enough to shew, that those which are left are not as you say upon Memory, *few in Comparison of those that are lost*. Nor are even these so lost but that the Authority of them appears on the Acts, and was it so in the Case of the Parliament Writs, I would not insist that only one and a piece of them did at present remain, but all the Acts concur to exclude the Interest of any other Writ in their passing, besides what respected the Convocation immediately, and the Royal Writs of Prorogations themselves, referr only to the Provincial Writ by which the Convocations are recognized to be held.

So that after all here is no room for your charge of imbezzeling, nor would you gain any thing by it if many more of the Archbishops Parliament Writs were in this manner preserved.

I will proceed therefore to consider whether you have clear'd the matter any better as to the Province of Canterbury.

To Clear your first Assertion from the Transcripts and Extracts of the Upper House Book of Canterbury Province you say that in these particular notice is taken of those several Parliament Writs as Enter'd in those Acts, and you referr to 7 Parliaments beginning from 1571 to the last of 1625 inclusive.

Now here again is a particular proof offered of a general Assertion of a constant practice to enter, &c. and upon a general appeal to the Extracts whereas your clearing evidence is confined here to 7 Parliaments out of twenty or more, and to almost as Exactly the bare third part of that Period of time to which you referr.

I must observe further, that if it be so as you say in these Extracts, it is contrary to the tenor of all those I cited before them, which are ten Convocations, and the Acts of one of them are entirely preserved, and that is of 1562 which transmitted the model of Convocations to those which ensued.

Let me add that the Remains of Convocations cited by me are in several hands, and easily seen, and shall be attested if you doubt of the truth, or have never seen them as I fancy you have: I believe so the rather for your fetching no Evidence from them, and because you referr your reader only to such as are in Dr A's hands.

Methinks this is an odd way of opening the
A 2 Eyes

*Priestwaff 3 p m
13 A 23
1 A 1 History of Convo
school 27*

Eyes of the Clergy in a matter pretended to be constant and general Practice to offer but 7 witnesses, and those hitherto kept in the dark, without so much as producing clearly what they affirm, as I have done in mine for the quite contrary practice.

You say indeed that notice is taken of those several Parliament Writs, as Enter'd in those Acts. Of Convocation you do or should mean, but you refer us to the Parliaments only, and add that the Folio of the Original Register wherein those Writs are recorded is set down in the Extract; and mention made of them then in these or the like words, the King's Writ to sit in Parliament, or the Kings Writ to the Archbishop for the Parliament. I hope by the Original Register you mean the Register of Convocation, or you sadly abuse us. I will therefore suppose you to mean what you ought, but still the mention of such Writs even in a Register of Convocation in such words as you give us above, is a very different thing from the entry of them in the Front of the Acts of the Synod, and the tender Mention you give us as made of these Writs, is a great presumption if not demonstration that they are not to enter'd as your Assertion requires, and yet these are those which you single out of the Extracts as being plain and full in the case the rest you own are not so Express.

There may possibly be Memorandums of such Writs as preserved in the manner that I took notice several were of different kinds at the end of the Transcript of the Acts of Convocation 1562. But such a Preservation of them as that, will have no Influence upon the Convocation at all tho' they should concur more in time, then those others I mention'd, did.

If your Extracts could have spoken plainer then this, I am apt to think we should have had those fuller expressions, however I will not hold you to these, if they can indeed speak more home to the purpose, bring them out, and they shall fairly be heard: 'Tis hard for me to say what is not in them, and yet I have offered enough from the Practice before, to persuade any impartial man, that there can be no such Entries as you have pretended. However to go on by the best light I can get into that interval of time to which these Extracts extend, without their Assistance.

The first Parliament you refer us to is 1571. And the Writ to the Archbishop for that Parliament is I should think most Authentickly preserved in the Archbishop's own M. S. Book left to his College, and now to be seen there, I have the Copy of this Writ from that Book before

me, in which Book none of the Acts of the Convocation of this Year appear, so that it cannot stand there as Enter'd in them; but let me further observe that this very Parliament Writ is also found among those Writs I before mention'd, to be preserved at the End of the Old Transcript of the Acts of the Convocation of 1562, to which it could have no sort of relation. So that if your Extracts refer to this Writ, as in either of these Books I have mention'd it is nothing to your purpose, if you say they plainly refer to the Register of the Convocation of this Year, pray make it appear.

This I believe you will not be able to do, at least not so as to make your Assertion good, because we have the Archbishop's Mandat to the Bishop of London, for this very Convocation entire, and no notice is taken in it, of any Royal Writ except the Provincial therein recited, and the only one he directs the Execution of, which would not be so if the Clergy were to be assembled in Synod, as well in vertue of the Parliament as Provincial Writ.

Your next Parliament is in 1572. I have only a reference to the Parliament and Provincial Writ of this Year, at the end of the Transcript above mention'd; which however will enable me to plead as I did before, that a reference in any Extracts to Writs so preserved, does not come at all to our point, and I am the more encouraged to do it this Year, because in the Archbishop's Speech at the opening of this Convocation, He addresses himself to the Bishops and Clergy as call'd by himself *Ex precepto Principis*, &c. which according to the Tenor of all the Fronts and Acts of Convocations I have cited, is a very fair implication of their sitting under the Archbishop in vertue but of one Writ.

Before I proceed to the next Parliament give me leave to observe, that in the Mandat of the Archbishop for publishing the Articles agreed on in Convocation, Anno 1585. That Convocation is said to have been begun in the Chapter House of St. Paul's, November 24. 1584. *Auctoritate Brevis Regii in ea parte Emanati*, which I think excludes the Parliament Writ as clearly as any form of entry can do. To this let me add the Queens Ratification of the Canons, in 1597. as I find it in the App. to Dr. A's second Edition of Rights, &c. in which Instrument mention is made four or five times of the Provincial Writ, by which that Convocation was call'd and held, without the least intimation of any other then what concern'd the Convocation only.

Having given you these two instances within your

*The Convocation Book
nothing is to be enter'd
the writ of Bishop
Cathedral of London
of Convocation but the
way only a copy
of such writs for
the Archbishop
in 1571
Convocation to London
the Chapter of a
Divine*

your own Period, though not in any of the Years you refer to, I am the less concern'd that I have nothing certain to offer to your next Year 1614.

But to make you amends I will here take notice of the Confirmation of the Canons by King James I. in 1604. wherein he refers to the Writ issued by him for the calling that Convocation, and to that Convocation, assembling according to the said Writ. Before the Bishop of London in the vacancy of the See Constituted, by another Writ President of the same Convocation. Which by the way, does also confirm my conjecture in my first Letter of Bishop Bonner's being Constituted President by Writ, 1554, and gives an account of the Writs said to be read in the Acts. the Writ for Presidency being as much to be read, as the ordinary Commission for it from the Guardians, which we find in that Case.

In your next Year 1620, I have nothing to offer, but the Mandat of the Bishop of London to the Bishop of Lichfield, to obey the Archbishop's Mandate, reciting the King's Provincial Writ, and directing only the Execution of that which yet is more to my purpose than any thing you have yet offered for yours.

I have nothing to oppose more particularly to your next three Parliaments from any Instrument of this Province before me, and therefore must leave them, till I know more certainly what your Extracts say.

You told us in your first Letter, that *The Entry of such Writs were taken notice of in the Reigns of Queen Elizabeth, King James, and King Charles the first, down to the very Convocation of 1640. when indeed the Actuary omitted to enter the Writ.* Now I have shewn that for some Years in Queen Elizabeth for the two first Convocations, it was quite otherwise, nor does your second Letter pretend to the contrary. Beginning the proofs from 1571, which as well as that from the next Year, I think are pretty much set aside, let them appear how they will.

As to King James the first's Reign, I think his own Letters Patents, ought to be heard, before any such reference, as you hint from your Extracts were they fuller then even you make them to be.

And as to King Charles the first's Reign you give up the most remarkable part, the Convocations of 1640. You say *then indeed the Actuary omitted to enter the Writ.* But pray how does this appear to have been an Omission, when hitherto there does not so much as one Entry of that kind appear, and you know in your Consci-

ence that what you add of the Execution of the Clause in that Year is no proof that the Writ itself ought to be *Enter'd*, in the *Convocation Books* as you would make your Reader believe. Things seem to have been done in the Upper House of that Convocation, as much in form as could be expected, and it is agreeable to the *Forma Tenendi*. It is not reasonable to imagine that Archbishop Laud would suffer any Omission in his Actuary so considerable, as this Omission must be if it was an Omission, but there is no ground to think it was so, for besides the agreeableness of these Entrys to Ancient forms, the Letters Patents of Confirmation of the Canons of this Convocation, like those of King James above mentioned, take no notice of any other then the Provincial Writs to the respective Archbishops, which added to the Instances of the two former Reigns is as full an argument as can be desired, that those very Princes you mention did not look upon their Convocations as held in any wise by the Parliament Writ. *But by his own Mandate and the King's*

And though the formal Recognition of that single Authority, does not appear in the *Front of the Acts* within the time you confine your Citations for want of the remains of *those Acts*, which in all the rest of the Period are distinct and particular enough. Yet the other concurrent Instruments do sufficiently supply that defect. And the Entire Acts of the Convocations of York, have the express Recognition of the single Provincial Writ, in the beginning of every Convocation of those Years to which you refer. So that your Extracts whatever they are can afford nothing for your purpose without flatly Contradicting all that remains besides them of the Acts of this Province, and the whole stream of the Convocations of York.

Thus have I consider'd this whole question again, as far as your Additional Letter made it necessary for me, and neither in the former or this Letter, have I wittingly conceal'd any thing I found in my search that favour'd your claim. This care has made both my Letters longer then I design'd they should be, and I can hardly justify my self in spending so much time in a cause that has so little on the opposite side, but that I was willing to open the Eyes of the Clergy you write to a little more faithfully in this matter then you have hitherto done, and shew them that it is possible for you to mislead them, if they will submissively follow, but that on the other hand it is very easy for them to keep themselves right if they will but examin a little, and judge for themselves. I am sure in the present dispute, they need not go far.

far to see you are either grossly deceived, or that you would grossly impose upon them, which is the heavier Charge, and I fear the more just.

For I cannot imagine as I observ'd at the beginning of this, that a complication of falsehoods put with so much management together could be the effect of your ignorance, though that would not be to be pardon'd, at the end of such a solemn Appeal, but an intended deceit as this has all the Appearance of being, is of a blacker Completion, and requires as solemn a recanting at least, to have it forgiven.

For let me tell you, Sir, that *Qualifying* or *Explaining* (the other two things one of which at least you require in your *Postscript*, to be done by another Person with relation to the *Mandat*) will not do in your Case. Nor do you pretend to have so much as *qualified* your former Assertion; *Explaining* is all you can plead you have done, and 'tis such an *Explaining* as you pretend to have given by way of *Clearing* the matter, which is not only left to stand as it did, but you conclude your *Postscript* with *Trust in God, that you shall never allow your self such lengths for the sake of a good cause, as you charge the*

Person, about the *Mandat*, for taking, to *serve an ill one*.

Now I think you have taken such lengths in the *Affertion* before us that if you can keep up your Credit under such a Cloud of Witnesses that so fully impeach it, I must conclude there is not encouragement enough for sincerity to be found in this World; but I have a better opinion of all men, of my Brethren especially, who are chiefly concern'd in this matter, then to think, they will set aside their regard to *Publique Records* rather than *Question the Integrity* of one who keeps his Conclusion at the same time, that he is forced to take notice himself, that his Premises fail. Nay, I will hope this of your self, that you will one day repent of that which upon the strictest enquiry I am able to make, appears the greatest prevarication that I ever yet met with, unless it be in your *Postscript*, to which this Answer for the present is sent you by,

SIR,

Dec. 16.
1701.

Your Humble Servant.

P O S T S C R I P T.

FROM your *Postscript*, I observe how natural it is for those who have forfeited their own Credit, to comfort themselves in blasting other Men's. You, or whoever else wrote the Piece entitled, *The Power of the Lower House to adjourn it self*, produc'd a Clause out of the Archiepiscopal Mandate, requiring the Proctors to bring Powers to consent to Continuations; and Dr. Kennet is charg'd with citing the Mandate unfairly upon his omission of this Clause, which is there affirm'd to be in several Forms of it, and intimated openly enough to belong to it.

The Method taken by the Author of the *Right of the Archbishop*, &c. to know the truth of that Assertion was this: The Registers of the Archbishop contain great numbers of Mandates, which were distinctly viewed for this purpose by a Publick Notary; and nothing of that Clause appearing, an Attestation thereof was made under the Notary's Hand, for a clear Testimony that it could be no proper part of the Mandate, and a full Vindication of Dr. Kennet.

You, in a *Postscript* to this Second Letter, make the World believe, *That in the very Re-*

gisters of the Archbishop to which this Attestation refers, there is more than one Mandate with this very Clause in it; that there is also ground to believe that the Editor of the Book was not wholly a Stranger to them at the moment he publish'd Mr. Tyllot's Attestation; and, that 'tis certain that he hath since been convinc'd in this respect, and yet suffer'd that Attestation to impose upon the world now for six weeks together. This is your charge, and you need not doubt but it will do the Work you intended, i. e. lead every body who shall rely on your Credit, to Suspect that there are one or more Mandates with that Clause in the Registers of the Archbishop, and that the Author of the Book when the Notary viewed those Seventy that have it not, conceal'd from him some others that have: Which, if true, was highly disingenuous in him who did it; but if false, very injurious and unchristian in you who charge it.

I have known the Writer of that Book some Years, and having ever had an Opinion of his Integrity, was surpriz'd at this Account; till discoursing with him about it, he desir'd me to charge

charge it upon you as a downright slander, and affirm'd, upon the word of a Christian.

1. That he neither knows nor believes that there is, or ever was, in the Archbishop's Registers any one Mandate with that clause or with any words to that effect.

2. That when the Attestation was publish'd, he did not know or believe that there was any where else more than one Form of a Mandate with such a clause; of which one he there speaks, as happening upon a remarkable contest between the Metropolitcal and Legatin Authority, and a particular Account whereof he says was then undertaken by another hand, in a Book which has been several Weeks in the Press; adding, that this part relating to the Mandate was Printed off at least a month ago. *As may*

3. That he continu'd to believe that there never was more than one such Form of an Archiepiscopal Mandate, till very lately he was told of another; which being accounted for upon the same contest between the two Authorities, within six years of the first, the same Persons still living, has no influence upon the present cause; and making the number but two in all, is far from justifying your first Assertion, that there are several in that very Form; and lastly, not being found in the Archbishop's Registers, does no way affect or invalidate the foresaid Attestation.

These three things he affirms to be strictly true; and in so tender a point as his Integrity thinks he has a Right to require you either Publickly to disprove them (which he is sure you never can doe,) or to show your self a Christian by asking pardon of God and Man for dispersing such groundless and Malicious Suggestions.

The truth is, to me who am so well acquainted with your style in other cases, your very manner of expressing the charge, was a Conviction that you your self did not believe it. For at the same time you lay the Scandal, you also provide an Evasion; and however desirous you were that others should believe it, yet you would not so far charge your self, as to say directly that things really are as you insinuate; but, *Would you believe, that in the very Registers of the Archbishop there should be more than one Mandate, with this very clause in it. And Fame says, that such Mandates there are in those very Registers?* But would you, I pray perswade me, that in a matter which so nearly concerns your Honour and Veracity, you could have suffer'd the Scandal to lay upon you so long, or have rely'd on the Reports of Fame, had you believ'd or even suspected that any such Mandates were really to be found in the Registers? Or suppose you to have rested upon Probabilities only, would you have conceal'd the grounds and reasons of your Conjecture, had you thought them such as could bring that Author's Integrity under Suspicion? If I mistake not, it has never been thought a part of your temper or practice, to lose any Opportunity of Disgracing others. And that others may have no just Advantages over you, 'twill be necessary you should learn to cite Records a little more exactly and Religiously. Other difficulties may sometimes be got over by some such Savings and Evasions as you are wont to lay in for the purpose. But these Attestations are stubborn things, and I doubt they will never cease to pursue you till you cease to impose upon the World by such gross mis-representations of matters of Fact.

E I N I S.

BOOKS printed for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn Gate in Holborn.

THE Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted, with particular respect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm, and Church of *England*; occasioned by a late Pamphlet, Intituled, *A Letter to a Convocation-man*, Octav.

An Appeal to all the true Members of the Church of *England*, in behalf of the King's Supremacy, as by Law established, by our Convocations approved, and by our most eminent Bishops and Clergy-men stated and defended, against both the Popish and Fanatical Opposers of it. Both by Dr. *William Wake*.

A Brief Inquiry into the Ground, Authority, and Rights of Ecclesiastical Synods, upon the Principles of Scripture and right Reason; occasioned by a late Book, Intituled, *Municipium Ecclesiasticum*, &c. Octav. price 6 d.

A Reconciling LETTER, upon the late Differences about *Convocational Rights* and Proceedings, as manag'd by those who have maintain'd the Liberties of the *Lower Clergy*.

The Case of the PRÆMUNIENTES considered: In an Answer to the Letter sent lately to a Clergy Man in the Country, concerning the Choice of Members, and Execution of the Parliament-Writ, for the Ensuing Convocation.

The late Pretence of a Constant Practice to enter the Parliament as well as Provincial Writ in the Front of the Acts of every Synod; Consider'd and Disprov'd, in a Letter to the Author of that Assertion; with a Certificate from the Register of *York*.

There is in the Press, *The State of the Church and Clergy of ENGLAND*, faithfully Represented from the *Saxon Times* to the present Century: Wherein the Constitution of *Ecclesiastical Synods* and *State-Convocations*, with respect to the *King's Supremacy* and the *Archbishop's Right*, is asserted against the pernicious Principles and mistaken Facts of Dr. *Atterbury's* Writings, in *Fol.*

Books Printed for A. and J. Churchill.

Ecclasiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of *England*, Historically Stated and Justly Vindicated from the Misrepresentations of Mr. *Atterbury*.

An Occasional Letter on the Subject of *English Convocations*. Both these by *VWhite Kennet*. D.D.

A Letter to a Friend in the Country, concerning the proceedings of the late Convocation.

A Vindication of the Authority of Christian Princes, over Ecclesiastical Synods. From the Exceptions made against it by Mr. *Hill*, and the pretences of Divine Right in his late Books on that Subject; and especially in his last Entitled, *The Rights and Liberties of the Christian Church Asserted*; to which are added, some Letters that pass between Dr. *Wake* and him, relating to that Controversie.

The Right of the Archbishop to *Continue* or *Prorogue* the whole Convocation, asserted in a second Letter, by way of Reply to a Pamphlet, Entitled the Power of the Lower-house of Convocation to Adjourn it self, &c. As also to a late Book, Entitled a Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower-house, &c. with the Publisher's preface, as far as they relate to the point of Continuation.

LONDON, Printed for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn.

